

**STATE FOREST LAND
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

Purpose of Checklist:

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can. *Questions in italics are supplemental to Ecology's standard environmental checklist. They have been added by the DNR to assist in the review of state forest land proposals. Adjacency and landscape/watershed-administrative-unit (WAU) maps for this proposal are available on the DNR internet website at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center." These maps may also be reviewed at the DNR regional office responsible for the proposal. This checklist is to be used for SEPA evaluation of state forest land activities.*

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later. *All of the questions are intended to address the complete proposal as described by your response to question A-11. The proposal acres in question A-11 may cover a larger area than the forest practice application acres, or the actual timber sale acres.*

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NON PROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer" and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Timber Sale Name: **CHARLIE HORSE***Agreement #:* **30-071889**
2. Name of applicant: **Department of Natural Resources**
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: **John Haddon, 713 Bowers Road, Ellensburg WA 98926 (509) 925-8510**
4. Date checklist prepared: **09/28/2004**
5. Agency requesting checklist: **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)**
6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):
 - a. *Auction Date:* **Spring 2005**
 - b. *Planned contract end date (but may be extended):* **Fall 2006**
 - c. *Phasing:* **N/A**
7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.
Yes

Timber Sale
 - a. *Site preparation:* **None**
 - b. *Regeneration Method:* **Majority of harvest area will be fully stocked following harvest. Unit #1, 18 acres may require some reforestation effort, to be assessed following harvest.**
 - c. *Vegetation Management:* **No**
 - d. *Thinning:* **Yes. A thinning to address stocking level and species composition is planned within 5 years following harvest.**

Roads: **Sale layout was designed to minimize new road construction by utilizing existing roads for majority of access. There will be 2720 feet of new construction, 11185 feet of existing road reconstruction, 16675 feet of existing road maintenance and 3400 feet of abandonment.**

Rock Pits and/or Sale: **Ballast rock as required for road construction will be obtained from an existing pit on state land in the SE¼SE¼ Section 34, Township 15 North, Range 15 East. Development and use will be subject to an approved development, use, and reclamation plan prepared by the Purchaser and approved by the DNR.**

Other: **At termination of sale, two existing roads (R-2540A and R-2520A) within the proposal area will be abandoned.**

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

- ☐ 303 (d) – listed water body in WAU: ☐ temp ☐ sediment ☐ completed TMDL (total maximum daily load):
- ☐ Landscape plan:
- ☒ Watershed analysis: **Oak Creek #380301**
- ☐ Interdisciplinary team (ID Team) report:
- ☒ Road design plan:
- ☒ Wildlife report:
- ☐ Geotechnical report:
- ☒ Other specialist report(s): **Archaeologist**
- ☐ Memorandum of understanding (sportsmen’s groups, neighborhood associations, tribes, etc.):
- ☒ Rock pit plan: **See question #7.**
- ☒ Other: **a) Forest Resource Plan: Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) adapted July 31, 1992. b) State Soil Survey. c) D.N.R. Habitat Conservation Plan adopted January 30, 1997, d) A Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan prepared by a Professional Engineer, e) D.N.R. Forestry Handbook.**

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain. **No.**

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

- ☐ HPA ☒ Burning permit ☐ Shoreline permit ☒ Incidental take permit ☒ FPA # **2703118** ☐ Other:

11. Give brief, complete description of our proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include specific information on project description.)

a. *Complete proposal description:* **The original proposal started out as 350 acres, but due to wildlife concerns, topography, harvest design, and habitat goals, the final net acres is 304. The Charlie Horse Timber Sale consists of 3 units: Unit #1 (18 acres), Unit#2 (168 acres), and Unit #3 (118 acres). All units are within Section 34, Township 15 North, Range 15 East, and are located in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Oak Creek Wildlife Area and in the Oak Creek Drainage of the Tieton Watershed. The proposal is on land designated as HCP “no role.” Elevation ranges from 3200-4100 feet. Soils are all stony loam, with medium to high erosion potential. Majority of harvest is on soils with medium erosion potential. Harvest on soils with high erosion potential is planned, but is limited to areas with slopes less than 40%. The potential for sediment delivery has been further reduced by the exclusion of all Type 5 and larger streams from the proposal. The area was previously harvested in 1981, and no indication of slope instability was identified within the proposal area. These units will be generally managed under recommended guidelines for the Douglas-fir series and specifically upon current stand composition and health conditions as detailed in section 11, b. Units will be harvested favoring a thinning from below with spacing of overstory as appropriate to meet management objectives as detailed in question 11, b. Harvest system will be ground based with equipment and operating limitations to minimize soil disturbance. Impacts from road construction and use will be reduced by using existing roads to access the majority of proposal area while requiring only reconstruction. Wildlife protection will be emphasized by the exclusion of all Type 5 and higher streams from the proposal area, retention of wildlife recruitment trees and closure of roads within the proposal area to limit access following harvest. Please see proceeding questions for more detailed information regarding this proposal.**

b. *Timber stand description pre-harvest (include major timber species and origin date), type of harvest, overall unit objectives.* **A stand assessment cruise and site visits by a DNR silviculturalist and biologist were done in 2003 and 2004 to gather accurate data for development of the management plan for the proposal area. The current stand composition is made up of nearly 80% Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine with the remaining 20% grand fir and western larch. Tree ages average approximately 50-100 years old for the majority of the stand with the exception of approximately four trees per acre (TPA) of large older Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine remnants scattered across the landscape which are 200+ years old. Regeneration is well established/fully stocked throughout majority of the proposal area with Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine being the primary seedling and sapling species. Current stand condition is in decline due to overstocking and associated infection primarily by dwarf mistletoe. Minor levels of infestation by mountain pine beetle, spruce budworm and balsam wooly adelgid are also present. Level of mistletoe infection and resultant damage is severe in portions of stands within each unit, and will continue to spread and infect healthy and productive portions, eventually resulting in a loss of economic and biologic sustainability, which is susceptible to a stand replacement event. Given this, the overall objective is to instead manage the stand towards a healthy, sustainable, and historic condition, which maintains productive wildlife habitat. This will be achieved through the following activities: In all units conduct a selection style harvest to reduce currently overstocked and disease susceptible stand condition which favors site appropriate species such as ponderosa pine and western larch with a Douglas-fir component not to exceed 30%. This will promote growth to selected species, releases suppressed understory, and promotes resistance to current and future health problems. Retain older remnants of dominant Douglas-fir and ponderosa pine except for those heavily infected with mistletoe. Protect wildlife habitat such as snags, wildlife recruitment trees, riparian areas and talus slopes. Retaining current regeneration and conducting a future thinning favoring healthiest ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir. Inventory data shows that we are leaving greater than 150 TPA <8.5” diameter across species range.**

c. *Road activity summary. See also forest practice application (FPA) for maps and more details.*

Type of Activity	How Many	Length (feet) (Estimated)	Acres (Estimated)	Fish Barrier Removals (#)
Construction		2720		
Reconstruction		11185		
Abandonment		16675		
Bridge Install/Replace	0			
Culvert Install/Replace (fish)	0			
Culvert Install/Replace (no fish)	1			

12. Location of proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you

should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist. (See timber sale map. See also color landscape/WAU map on the DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

- a. Legal description: **Township 15 North, Range 15 East, Section 34**
- b. Distance and direction from nearest town (include road names): **Approximately 10 miles northwest from Naches WA. Access via the USFS 1400 /Oak Creek road and the USFS 216 / DNR R-2500 road.**
- c. Identify the watershed administrative unit (WAU), the WAU Sub-basin(s), and acres. (See also landscape/WAU map on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center.”)

WAU Name	WAU Acres	Proposal Acres
OAK CREEK	37037	304

13. Discuss any known future activities not associated with this proposal that may result in a cumulative change in the environment when combined with the past and current proposal(s). (See digital ortho-photos for WAU and adjacency maps on DNR website <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under “SEPA Center” for a broader landscape perspective.)
- This proposal is located in the Oak Creek Watershed Analysis Unit (#380301/25210 acres). According to the DNR’s GIS Forest Practice Application database as of 12/08/04, in the past seven years, there has been 1831 acres of timber harvested within this WAU. By Forest Practice definition, 833 acres have been even-aged harvested, 929 have been uneven-aged harvested, and 69 acres have been salvaged harvested. On DNR land there were no evenage harvests and 165 acres of unevenaged harvest. The timber in this WAU is dominated by 50-100 year old trees. The WAU is experiencing declining forest health effects from overstocking, improper species composition, aggressive fire suppression, and past management activities. The DNR is currently working with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USF&WS) and the Washington Sate Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to develop a strategy to move these forests back to a historical stocking and species composition. This strategy is consistent with the HCP, Forest Resource Plan and Forest Practice rules and regulations.

Current site conditions: Current stand conditions are in decline due to overstocking, which stresses individual trees, reducing vigor and resistance to insect and disease pathogens. Stands are infected primarily by dwarf mistletoe and infestation by Mountain Pine Beetle. Increasing levels of infestation by spruce budworm and balsam wooly adelgid are also present. Level of infection and resultant damage is severe in portions of each unit, and will continue to spread into majority of healthy and productive portions remaining, eventually resulting in the stand losing economic and biological value and sustainability, and becoming increasingly susceptible to a stand replacement event. By acting now to shift the stand to a post-harvest stocking level which favors site appropriate species, redistributes growth to selected healthy leave trees, releases suppressed understory, and promotes resistance to current and future health problems, we are moving this stand towards a desired future condition.

Future activities in WAU: Sections 27, 33, and 35 immediately adjacent to the proposal are owned by WDFW with Boise Building Solutions, Manufacturing LLC (Boise), reserving timber rights for harvest. Each section has portions which have been harvest since the early 1990’s. Section 3, Township 14 North, Range 15 East is currently owned by The Nature Conservancy. Lands beyond this area are mixed DNR, USFS, WDFW and private corporate which have had regeneration and thinning harvests completed in the last 20 years.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (check one):
- ☐Flat, ☐Rolling, ☒Hilly, ☐Steep Slopes, ☐Mountainous, ☐Other:
- 1) General description of the WAU or sub-basin(s) (landforms, climate, elevations, and forest vegetation zone).
- 2) Identify any difference between the proposal location and the general description of the WAU or sub-basin(s).
- None of the proposal is within the rain-on-snow zone. Elevation ranges from 3200-4100 feet. Units #1 and #2 are located on the north side of the North Fork Oak Creek. Unit (s) aspect is south with majority of slopes less than 30%. Unit #3 is located on the south side of the North Fork Oak Creek. Unit aspect is northeast with majority of slopes less than 30%. There are small portions within each unit with steeper slopes up to 40%.**
- b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)? **40%**
- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland. *Note: The following table is created from state soil survey data. It is a roll-up of general soils information for the soils found in the entire sale area. It is only one of several site assessment tools used in conjunction with actual site inspections for slope stability concerns or erosion potential. It can help indicate potential for shallow, rapid soil movement, but often does not represent deeper soil sub-strata. The actual soils conditions in the sale area may vary considerably based on land-form shapes, presence of erosive situations, and other factors. The state soil survey is a compilation of various surveys with different standards.*

State Soil Survey #	Soil Texture or Soil Complex Name	% Slope	Acres	Mass Wasting Potential	Erosion Potential
7601	SUTKIN	5-40	123	LOW	MEDIUM
3623	JUMPE	5-40	45	NO DATA	MEDIUM
7602	SUTKIN	5-30	18	MEDIUM	HIGH
3627	JUMPE	5-30	32	MEDIUM	HIGH
3624	JUMPE	0-20	25	LOW	MEDIUM
3626	JUMPE	0-40	61	LOW	MEDIUM

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.
- 1) Surface indications: **None**

- 2)

Is there evidence of natural slope failures in the sub-basin(s)?

☐No

☒Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

Shallow failures have occurred in drainage areas during high water flow events. This information is based on WAU information only, no sub-basin WAU information is available for Eastern Washington.
- 3)

Are there slope failures in the sub-basin(s) associated with timber harvest activities or roads?

☒No

☐Yes, type of failures (shallow vs. deep-seated) and failure site characteristics:

Associated management activity:
- 4)

Is the proposed site similar to sites where slope failures have occurred previously in the sub-basin(s)?

☒No

☐Yes, describe similarities between the conditions and activities on these sites:
- 5)

Describe any slope stability protection measures (including sale boundary location, road, and harvest system decisions) incorporated into this proposal.

Soil type, stability, and erosion concerns were key issues of consideration in development of the proposal. See B 1 h below for detailed list of stability protection measures

- e.

Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Approx. acreage new roads: 1.8 Approx. acreage new landings: 4.0 Fill source: N/A
- f.

Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Minor erosion may occur on disturbed surfaces during heavy rain events and seasonal snowmelt. Potential for erosion will be minimized by sale design, ensuring active road and skid trail maintenance, installing and maintaining drainage structures and restricting operations to seasonally dry periods.
- g.

About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

None. Approximate percent of proposal in permanent road running surface (includes gravel roads): None.
- h.

Propose measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:
(Include protection measures for minimizing compaction or rutting.)

1. Proposal boundaries were located to exclude excessively steep slopes.

2. Proposal boundaries were located to avoid excessive soil disturbance from harvest operations.

3. All streams larger than a Type 5 are excluded from proposal boundaries to avoid disturbance.

4. Limiting road erosion and compaction potential by primarily using existing roads.

5. Road development and use will be restricted to dry or frozen conditions.

6. All roads in the proposal have been reviewed by a professional engineer.

7. All roads will have appropriate and functional drainage structures installed and maintained.

8. Harvest and haul operations are suspended between November 1 and May 1 unless otherwise approved.

9. Harvest and haul operations can be suspended as necessary to minimize erosion, compaction, and rutting.

10. Inactive skid trails will be blocked and have water bars and slash filters installed to reduce erosion potential.

11. Designated skid trails can be required and approved prior to use to reduce erosion potential.

12. Grass seeding and fertilization of designated road surface and slopes per the sales contract.

13. Deactivation and/or abandonment of 3400' of road to restrict vehicle access.
2. Air
- a.

What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust from truck traffic, rock mining, crushing or hauling, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Minor amounts of exhaust and dust will be generated during the operation.

b.

Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

No.

c.

Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

None required.
3. Water
- a.

Surface:

1)

Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into. (See timber sale map and forest practice base maps.)

a)

Downstream water bodies: North Fork Oak Creek

b)

Complete the following riparian & wetland management zone table:

Wetland, Stream, Lake, Pond, or Saltwater Name (if any)	Water Type	Number (how many?)	Avg RMZ/WMZ Width in Feet (per side for streams)
N. Fork Oak Creek	3	1	100+ feet
UNNAMED	4	2	50+feet

c)

List RMZ/WMZ protection measures including silvicultural prescriptions, road-related RMZ/WMZ protection measures, and wind buffers. Because the boundaries of the timber sale are greater than required RMZ widths, there are no RMZs marked on the ground.

2)

Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) to the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

☐No

☒Yes (See RMZ/WMZ table above and timber sale map.)

Description (include culverts):

No timber harvest will occur within RMZs as listed above. RMZs have been bounded out of the harvest area to avoid disturbance. At 135+45 on the R-2500, an existing culvert will be replaced on the unnamed Type 4.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material. **None.**
- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. (*Include diversions for fish-passage culvert installation.*)
☒No ☐Yes, describe:
- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.
☒No ☐Yes, describe location:
- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.
☒No ☐Yes, type and volume:
- 7) *Does the sub-basin contain soils or terrain susceptible to surface erosion and/or mass wasting? What is the potential for eroded material to enter surface water?*

No. Low potential for sediment delivery as majority of soils within proposal are all stony loam with low to medium mass wasting and erosion potential. Soil area within proposal with high rating for erosion potential (Sutkin 7602) is on slopes not exceeding 40 percent. This is below the slope classification of 45-65 percent for this soil type. Soil Potential for sediment delivery has been further reduced by the exclusion of all Type 5 and higher streams to avoid disturbance. Operations will also be restricted to seasonally dry or frozen periods. Minor erosion could occur however on disturbed surfaces during heavy rain events and seasonal snowmelt. See question B 1 h above for additional protection measures.

- 8) *Is there evidence of changes to the channels in the WAU and sub-basin(s) due to surface erosion or mass wasting (accelerated aggradations, erosion, decrease in large organic debris (LOD), change in channel dimensions)?*
☐No ☒Yes, describe changes and possible causes: **There have been several 100 year floods in the last 30 years that have contributed to minor channel migration, scouring, erosion, and damage to roads and drainage structures.**
- 9) *Could this proposal affect water quality based on the answers to the questions 1-8 above?*
☒No ☐Yes, explain:
- 10) *What are the approximate road miles per square mile in the WAU and sub-basin(s)?* **5.7 miles**
Are you aware of areas where forest roads or road ditches intercept sub-surface flow and deliver surface water to streams, rather than back to the forest floor?
☒No ☐Yes, describe:
- 11) *Is the proposal within a significant rain-on-snow (ROS) zone? If not, **STOP HERE** and go to question B-3-a-13 below. Use the WAU or sub-basin(s) for the ROS percentage questions below.*
☐No ☒Yes, approximate percent of WAU in significant ROS zone. **34%**
Approximate percent of sub-basin(s): **N/A**
- 12) *If the proposal is within the significant ROS zone, what is the approximate percentage of the WAU or sub-basin(s) within the significant ROS zone (all ownerships) that is (are) rated as hydrologically mature?* **10%**
- 13) *Is there evidence of changes to channels associated with peak flows in the WAU or sub-basin(s)?*
☐No ☒Yes, describe observations: **There have been several 100-year floods in the last 30 years that have contributed to minor channel migration.**
- 14) *Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-13 above, describe whether and how this proposal, in combination with other past, current, or reasonably foreseeable proposals in the WAU and sub-basin(s), may contribute to a peak flow impact.*
Water flows may increase slightly during low flow periods due to decreased transpiration and interception.
- 15) *Is there water resource (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or downslope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in surface water amounts, quality, or movements as a result of this proposal?*
☒No ☐Yes, possible impacts:
- 16) *Based on your answers to questions B-3-a-10 through B-3-a-15 above, note any protection measures addressing possible peak flow/flooding impacts.* **See B 1 h.**

b. Ground Water:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known. **No.**
- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve. **N/A.**
- 3) *Is there a water resource use (public, domestic, agricultural, hatchery, etc.), or area of slope instability, downstream or down slope of the proposed activity that could be affected by changes in groundwater amounts, timing, or movements as a result this proposal?*
☒No ☐Yes, describe:
 - a) *Note protection measures, if any.* **See question B 1 h above.**

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.
Storm water and seasonal snowmelt will be channeled through cross drains, culverts and waterbars to dissipate on the forest floor.
 - 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe. **None into ground water.**
 - a) *Note protection measures, if any.*
- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:
(See surface water, ground water, and water runoff sections above, questions B-3-a-1-c, B-3-a-16, B-3-b-3-a, and B-3-c-2-a.)
(See surface water, ground water, and water runoff sections above, questions B 1 h , B-3-a-1-c, B-3-a-16, B-3-b-3-a, and B-3-c-2-a.)

4. Plants

- a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:
- ☒deciduous tree: ☐alder, ☐maple, ☒aspen, ☒cottonwood, ☒western larch, ☐birch, ☐other: **willow**
☒evergreen tree: ☒Douglas fir, ☒grand fir, ☐Pacific silver fir, ☒ponderosa pine, ☐lodgepole pine,
☐western hemlock, ☐mountain hemlock, ☐Englemann spruce, ☐Sitka spruce,
☐red cedar, ☐yellow cedar, ☐other:
☒shrubs: ☐huckleberry, ☐salmonberry, ☐salal, ☐other: **Bitterbrush, Ceanothus, Ocean spray, Snowberry, Ninebark**
☒grass: : **Pinegrass, Bluebunch wheatgrass**
☐pasture
☐crop or grain
☐wet soil plants: ☐cattail, ☐buttercup, ☐bullrush, ☐skunk cabbage, ☐devil's club, ☐other:
☐water plants: ☐water lily, ☐eelgrass, ☐milfoil, ☐other:
☐other types of vegetation:
☐plant communities of concern:
- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered? (See answers to questions A-11-a, A-11-b, B-3-a-1-b and B-3-a-1-c. The following sub-questions merely supplement those answers.)
- 1) Describe the species, age, and structural diversity of the timber types immediately adjacent to the removal area.
(See landscape/WAU and adjacency maps on the DNR website at: <http://www.dnr.wa.gov> under "SEPA Center.")
Sections to the north, east, and west of proposal is WDFW ownership with Boise retaining timber rights. Boise has completed partial cuts within all sections over the last 20 years. Section to south was owned by Plum Creek Timber Co. and was last harvested in early 1990's. Section was purchased by The Nature Conservancy in 2002.

In Unit #1, area directly adjacent to the north is WDFW ownership with Boise Cascade Corp retaining timber rights. Boise completed a partial cut within this section in 2003. Area directly west of Unit #1 is WDFW ownership with Boise retaining timber rites. Boise completed a partial cut within this section in 1991. Area directly east of Unit #1 is an unharvested Type 4 riparian area, which separates Units #1 and #2 and has been excluded from proposal to avoid disturbance. Area directly south of Unit #1 is the North Fork Oak Creek Type 3 riparian area, which separates Units #1 and #2 from Unit #3 on the south side of the creek. Riparian area has been excluded from proposal to avoid disturbance.

In Unit #2, area directly adjacent to the north is WDFW ownership with Boise retaining timber rights. Boise completed a partial cuts within this section in 2003. Area directly east of Unit #2 is WDFW ownership with Boise retaining timber rights. Boise completed a partial cut within this section prior to 1991. Area directly south of Unit #2 is the North Fork Oak Creek Type 3 riparian area, which separates Units #1 and #2 from Unit #3 on the south side of the creek. Riparian area has been excluded from proposal to avoid disturbance. Area directly west of Unit #2 is an unharvested Type4 riparian area, which separates Units #1 and #2 and has been excluded from proposal to avoid disturbance.

In Unit #3, area directly north is the North Fork Oak Creek Type 3 riparian area, which separates Units #1 and #2 from Unit #3 on the north side of the creek. Riparian area has been excluded from proposal to avoid disturbance. Area directly east of Unit #2 is WDFW ownership, with Boise retaining timber rights. Boise completed a partial cut within this section prior to 1991. Area directly south and east of Unit #3 is DNR ownership within the same section. A stand of multi-aged, unevenly structured, variably stocked Douglas-fir, grand fir, western larch, and scattered ponderosa pine is found on this rocky, northeast slope. Area was partial cut by DNR in 1981. Area was not included in current proposal.
 - 2) *Retention tree plan:* **N/A**
- c. List threatened or endangered *plant* species known to be on or near the site. **None known.**
- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any: **None**

5. Animal

- a. Circle or check any birds animals *or unique habitats* which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:
- birds: ☒hawk, ☐heron, ☐eagle, ☒songbirds, ☐pigeon, ☐other: woodpecker, raven, grouse, turkey, sapsucker
mammals: ☒deer, ☐bear, ☒elk, ☒beaver, ☐other: Bats
fish: ☐bass, ☐salmon, ☒trout, ☐herring, ☐shellfish, ☐other:
unique habitats: ☒talus slopes, ☐caves, ☐cliffs, ☐oak woodlands, ☒balds, ☐mineral springs

- b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site (*include federal- and state-listed species*).
None known
- c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.
☒ *Pacific flyway* ☐ *Other migration route:* Explain if any boxes checked: **This is part of the Pacific Flyway migration route but is not used extensively by waterfowl.**
- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:
- 1) *Note existing or proposed protection measures, if any, for the complete proposal described in question A-11.*
- Species /Habitat: **Multiple species** Protection Measures: **Wildlife reserve trees and green recruitment trees have been left scattered throughout the proposal area. Downed non-merchantable logs will be retained post harvest. Trees with large dwarf mistletoe brooms were retained for wildlife use where possible. Some roads will be blocked and/or decommissioned post harvest. Firewood cutting will only be allowed on the north side of North Fork Oak Creek to protect and retain snags on the south side of the creek. Most talus slopes have been protected.**
- Species /Habitat: **Stream Riparian Zone** Protection Measures: **All Type 5 and higher streams were excluded from proposal area to protect riparian function. Unit boundaries were located well outside North Fork Oak Creek riparian zone to protect riparian ecotones, wildlife corridor, elk wallows and wildlife recruitment trees. Sale boundary was positioned on geographic breaks above the riparian area.**

6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project’s energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc. **N/A**
- b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe. **N/A**
- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any: **N/A**

7. Environmental Health

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.
- 1) Describe special emergency services that might be required. **No.**
- 2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any: **None**
- b. Noise
- 1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)? **N/A.**
- 2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from this site. **Logging equipment and log trucks will create noise while working on the project.**
- 3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any: **None required**

8. Land and Shoreline Use

- a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? (*Site includes the complete proposal, e.g. rock pits and access roads.*) **Forest management.**
- b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe. **Yes. Historically the proposal area has been used for livestock grazing. Currently there is no grazing lease within proposal area.**
- c. Describe any structures on the site. **None.**
- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what? **None.**
- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site? **Forest Resource Zone**
- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site? **Forestry.**
- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site? **N/A**
- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an “environmentally sensitive” area? If so, specify. **No.**
- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project? **None.**
- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace? **None.**
- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any: **None.**
- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any: **Proposal is consistent with current long term forest management designation.**

9.

Housing

a.

Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. N/A

b.

Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing. N/A

c.

Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any: N/A
10.

Aesthetics

a.

What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principle exterior building material(s) proposed? N/A

b.

What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed? N/A

1)

Is this proposal visible from a residential area, town, city, developed recreation site, or a scenic vista?
☒No ☐Yes, viewing location:

2)

Is this proposal visible from a major transportation or designated scenic corridor (county road, state or interstate highway, US route, river, or Columbia Gorge SMA)?
☒No ☐Yes, scenic corridor name:

3)

How will this proposal affect any views described in 1) or 2) above? N/A

c.

Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any: None required.

11.

Light and Glare

a.

What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur? N/A

b.

Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views? N/A

c.

What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal? N/A

d.

Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any: None required.

12.

Recreation

a.

What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?
Hunting, fishing, hiking, bird watching, horseback riding, mountain biking, ORV riding.

b.

Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe: No.

c.

Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any: Signing to warn of associated hazards with timber harvest and truck traffic on Oak Creek, USFS 214 and 216 roads.

13.

Historic and Cultural Preservation

a.

Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe. No.

b.

Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site. None.

c.

Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:
(Include all meetings or consultations with tribes, archaeologists, anthropologists or other authorities.)
A cultural resource survey was conducted in 2003–2004 with no sites found. Currently there are no elements identified per 13 b. above. Should any elements be identified within the proposal area during the timber harvest, work will cease in that area, and a professional archeologist will be notified immediately.

14.

Transportation

a.

Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any. Highway 12, Interstate 82, Oak Creek road, USFS 214 and USFS 216 roads.

1)

Is it likely that this proposal will contribute to an existing safety, noise, dust, maintenance, or other transportation impact problem(s)? No.

b.

Is site currently served by public transit? N/A .If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

c.

How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate? N/A

d.

Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private). 2720' of new construction in Unit #2. Existing forest roads will require only reconstruction. All forest roads are used for the purpose of forest management activities and will be maintained at Forest Practice standards.
- 8
- Form Rev. July 3, 2003

1) *How does this proposal impact the overall transportation system/circulation in the surrounding area, if at all?*
There will be a temporary increase in log traffic and possible dust along the roads used in the proposal.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe. **No.**
- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur. **During completion of project, between 3 to 10 loads of logs will be removed each day during actual operations. No vehicles trips will be generated following completion of project.**
- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any: **Signing to warn of associated hazards with timber harvest and truck traffic on Oak Creek, USFS 214 and 216 roads. Please see section B, 1, h. for list of additional measures.**

15. **Public Services**

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe. **N/A**
- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any. **N/A**

16. **Utilities**

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other. **None.**
- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed. **N/A**

C. **SIGNATURE**

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Proposed by:	_____	Date:	_____
	ERIK MELLANDER, Forester		
Reviewed by:	_____	Date:	_____
	KEN MCNAMEE, District Manager		
	_____	Date:	_____
	JOHN HADDON, Management Forester		
Approved by:	_____	Date:	_____
	GEORGE B. SHELTON, Assistant Region Manager		